

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on August 23, 2004 is acknowledged. The Applicant requests continued examination of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant submits this paper with a formal request for a continued examination.

Claims 140-151, 153-156, 158-164, 167-173, 175-178, 180-192 and 195-211 are pending in the present application. Claims 198 and 203 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. In addition, all pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of the teachings of various pieces of prior art. For the reasons set forth in detail below, Applicants believe the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 140

The Examiner rejects claim 140 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of U.S. Patent 5,893,132 to Huffman et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Huffman") and U.S. Patent 6,331,867 to Eberhard et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Eberhard"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection.

Applicant has amended claim 140 in order to more distinctly claim the present invention and proceed quickly to issuance. Specifically, claim 140 now requires that the casing include "a front and a back." A touch screen is located in the front of the casing when the casing is folded open, and a manipulation region is located on the rear of the casing when the casing is open. The prior art cited by the Examiner does not disclose this. Thus, Applicant believes the claim 140 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 168

The Examiner also rejects claim 168 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Huffman and Eberhard. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In order to proceed quickly to issuance, however, Applicant has amended claim 168 to more distinctly claim the present invention. Specifically, claim 168 now requires that the casing include "a front and a back." A touch screen is located in the front of the casing, and a manipulation region is located on the rear of the casing. Applicant asserts the cited prior art does not teach these limitations. Thus, Applicant believes the claim 168 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 198

The Examiner rejects claim 198 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Huffman. Claim 198 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant believes claim 198 is now in condition for allowance.

In order to proceed quickly to issuance, Applicant has amended claim 198 to more distinctly claim the present invention. Specifically, claim 198 now requires that the casing have "a front and a rear." A display is located in the front of the casing, and an at least one manipulation region is located in the rear of the casing. Applicant asserts the cited prior art does not teach this.

In addition, Applicant has amended claim 198 in order to remove language reading "may be removed." Claim 198 now requires that the virtual operating elements "disappear" from view when the display apparatus displays information. With these changes, Applicant believes claim 198 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 203

Claim 203 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended claim 203 to replace the words "may be" with the word "is." With this change, Applicant believes claim 203 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 208

The Examiner rejects claim 208 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Huffman and Eberhard. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In order to proceed quickly to issuance, Applicant has amended claim 208 in order to more distinctly claim the present invention. Specifically, claim 208 now requires a housing with "a front and a rear." A display area displays information in the front of the housing, and a navigation input means is located in the rear of the housing. Applicant asserts the cited prior art does not teach these limitations. Thus, Applicant believes the claim 208 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 209

The Examiner rejects claim 209 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Huffman and Eberhard. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In rejecting claim 209, the Examiner fails to explain which of the cited references teaches "the at least one navigation input means being located on a side of the housing opposite to the display area when the display area is orientated towards a user." In both Huffman and Eberhard, the operation functions are positioned in such a manner so as to be orientated in the same direction as the display area. Neither reference shows the navigation input means located in the housing opposite the display area when the display area is orientated towards the user. Accordingly, Applicant believes claim 209 is allowable over the cited prior art and requests that if the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner point out where the prior art references teach the at least one navigation input means located on the housing opposite to the display area when the display area is orientated towards a user.

Claim 210

The Examiner rejects claim 210 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Huffman and Eberhard. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In order to proceed quickly to issuance, Applicant has amended claim 210 to more distinctly claim the present invention. Specifically, claim 210 now requires that the housing have "a front portion and a rear portion." An at least one display area is located in the front portion of the housing, and an at least one navigation input means is disposed in the rear portion of the housing. Applicant asserts the

Appl. No. 09/508,794
Amdt. Dated February 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2004

cited prior art does not teach these limitations. Thus, Applicant believes the claim 210 is allowable over the cited references.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant believes the pending claims are allowable over the cited prior art. Moreover, as all dependent claims depend from the independent claims discussed above, Applicant believes all pending claims are allowable over the cited prior art. Thus, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance, and accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests passage thereof.

If necessary to affect a timely response, please consider this paper a request for an extension of time, and charge any shortages in fees, or apply any overpayment credits, to Baker & Daniels' Deposit Account No. 02-0387 (72262.90033). However, please do not include the payment of issue fees.

Appl. No. 09/508,794
Amdt. Dated February 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Groen, Reg. No. 32,230
BAKER & DANIELS
205 West Jefferson Boulevard, Suite 250
South Bend, IN 46601
Telephone: (574) 234-4149
Fax: (574) 239-1900

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the U.S. Postal
Service as First Class Mail in an envelope
addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on

February 23, 2004

Date



Eric J. Groen, Reg. No. 32,230